

## REMARKS

The Examiner has identified several issues with respect to Applicant's submission of certain prior art for consideration in an IDS dated February 29, 2008. Applicant addresses the issues raised by the Examiner as set forth below.

### **1. JAPANESE REFERENCE JP43-17461**

The Examiner has noted that the JP43-17461 reference as described in the Japanese Patent Report does not correspond with the translation provided for that reference by the Applicant.

Applicant has now determined that in the IDS submitted on February 29, 2008, Applicant inadvertently submitted the *wrong* Japanese reference (although having the *identical* number) as the reference which was referred to in the Japanese Patent Report. Applicant herewith provides for consideration by the Examiner a supplemental IDS including the *correct* JP43-17461 reference entitled (loosely translated), "Reciprocating Movement Mechanism." JP43-17461 is 12 pages in length and includes Figures 1-13. In addition, Applicant has included with the reference an English language description of the reference.

### **2. JAPANESE REFERENCE JP59-203801**

It has appeared to the Examiner that Figures 10-13 were missing from Japanese reference JP59-203801, as submitted by Applicant with the IDS on February 29, 2008.

Applicant has now determined that in the IDS submitted on February 29, 2008, Applicant inadvertently attached an English language description of the JP43-17461

reference to the *JP59-203801* reference. (That English language description discusses the *13 figures* of the *JP43-17461* reference – which may likely be the source of the discrepancy noted by the Examiner). Applicant herewith provides for consideration by the Examiner a supplemental IDS re-submitting the *JP59-203801* reference. The *JP59-203801* reference is 3 pages in length and includes Figures 1-7. In addition, Applicant has included an English language abstract *and* of the *JP59-203801* reference.

**3. Possible Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner has preliminarily remarked upon the possible rejection of newly proposed claim 20. Applicant shall withhold any remarks on this issue pending receipt of the Examiner's substantive action on the merits in this regard.

**Conclusion**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 12, 2008

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /dpu/  
David P. Utykanski  
Reg. No. 39,052

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

DPU/src